

AMENDMENT

In the Specification

Please amend a paragraph that begins on page 8 at line 22 to become the text set forth below.

While decoding the compressed video bitstream 42 assembled as described above reproduces frames of motion video that are generally visually acceptable, reproduced frames of still images, particularly still images containing text, are in many instances, if not most, visually unacceptable. As described above, the process depicted in FIG. 3 of separately computing the DCTs 82 for the luminance blocks 76 and the chrominance blocks 78, quantizing the DCT coefficients, zigzag ordering of quantized DCT coefficients, run-length encoding, and finally Huffman coding generally remove a significant amount of high frequency data from MPEG compressed I frames 54. Decoding of I frames 54 from which high frequency data has been removed produces an image having less detail, e.g. sharp corners and abrupt transitions from one color or intensity to another, than appeared in the uncompressed frame of video data. However, MPEG compression does not completely discard this high frequency data, i.e. image detail. MPEG compression attempts to encode this high frequency data into successive P frames 56 and B frames 58 that use the I frame 54

cl
mt

Chad

as a reference, either directly or indirectly. Consequently, after decoding the lesser detail in each I frame 54 of a still image, decoding subsequent P frames 56 and B frames 58 increases, over time, the detail present in the video images until the next I frame 54 is decoded.

In the Claims

Please substitute the following amended claim 4 for that presently pending in the application.

C2

4. (Amended) The method of claim 1 wherein parameters used in encoding the data for the still image produce an amount of data for the I frame that approaches, but remains less than, storage capacity of a buffer memory included in a decoder that stores the
5 compressed video bitstream.

REMARKS

In view of the following remarks, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application.

Objections and Rejections

The Examiner's Action dated February 12, 2002, Paper no. _:

1. objects to claim 4;
2. rejects claims 2 and 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite;